



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

08/794,851 02/04/97 BARANY

F 19603/461 (CR

EXAMINER

HM12/0221

MICHAEL L GOLDMAN  
NIXON HARGRAVE DEVANS AND DOYLE  
CLINTON SQUARE  
P O BOX 1051  
ROCHESTER NY 14603

CONNALURI, P  
ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1627  
DATE MAILED:

02/21/01

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

**Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks**

**BEST AVAILABLE COPY**

**Advisory Action**Application No.  
**08/794,851**

Applicant(s)

**Barany et al**

Examiner

**P. Ponnaluri**

Group Art Unit

**1627**

## THE PERIOD FOR RESPONSE: [check only a) or b)]

- a) ☐ expires \_\_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ expires either three months from the mailing date of the final rejection, or on the mailing date of this Advisory Action, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for the response expire later than six months from the date of the final rejection.

Any extension of time must be obtained by filing a petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a), the proposed response and the appropriate fee. The date on which the response, the petition, and the fee have been filed is the date of the response and also the date for the purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. Any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.17 will be calculated from the date of the originally set shortened statutory period for response or as set forth in b) above.

- ☒ Appellant's Brief is due two months from the date of the Notice of Appeal filed on Jan 30, 2001 (or within any period for response set forth above, whichever is later). See 37 CFR 1.191(d) and 37 CFR 1.192(a).

Applicant's response to the final rejection, filed on Jan 30, 2001 has been considered with the following effect, but is NOT deemed to place the application in condition for allowance:

- ☐ The proposed amendment(s):
- ☐ will be entered upon filing of a Notice of Appeal and an Appeal Brief.
  - ☐ will not be entered because:
    - ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search. (See note below).
    - ☐ they raise the issue of new matter. (See note below).
    - ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal.
    - ☐ they present additional claims without cancelling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_

**BEST AVAILABLE COPY**

- ☒ Applicant's response has overcome the following rejection(s):

The art rejections of record.

- ☐ Newly proposed or amended claims \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims.
- ☒ The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  
The declaration by inventor Barany has been considered, and would overcome the art rejections of record. The application is not in condition for allowance because of potential obviousness double patenting rejections and indefinite claim language
- ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
- ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the status of the claims is as follows (see attached written explanation, if any):  
Claims allowed: NONE  
Claims objected to: NONE  
Claims rejected: 1-43, 45-66, 75-80, 82-88, and 138-151
- ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ ☐ has ☐ has not been approved by the Examiner.
- ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- ☒ Other During the search related applications which were not made of record have been identified. Informed applicants attorney that a potential obviousness double patenting rejections over pending application 09/440,523 and obviousness rejection over US Patent 6,027,889.

*P. Ponnaluri* PATENT EXAMINER, AU 1627  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600